

Date: Mon, 20 Jun 94 04:30:11 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #684  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Mon, 20 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 684

## Today's Topics:

IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.  
lab power supplies  
RF problems in Ford Taurus???  
Transatlantic 50 MHz Es opening  
TRANSVERTERS

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 12:06:14 GMT  
From: iglou!gregl.slip.iglou.com!ke4dpx@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CrLInz.845@world.std.com> dts@world.std.com (Daniel T Senie) writes:

>Of course you would not mind the examination fee being raised to \$25 or  
>\$50 per exam so that VE teams could recoup the cost of the computers, right?  
>We who serve as VEs certainly would like to find workable ways to cut down  
>license delays, but keep in mind that we are volunteers. My team does  
>contribute our own pens, paper, etc., but don't necessarily have a laptop  
>computer handy. Many of the test sites have no phones. Sure we could use  
>cell phones in some places (where there is cell phone service), but that  
>can cost quite a bit, and data over cell phones is not the best...

I have to agree, and this is the same argument I've used locally about having the VEs electronically submit applications. While some VE teams may be able to

afford a computer and a modem, it certainly doesn't apply to all VE teams. And while having the VEs submit electronic forms to the VEC within 48 hours would get around the problem of not having access to a phone at the testing site, it still doesn't get around the monetary problem of buying the necessary equipment.

On the other hand, I don't see any reason the VECs could not file electronically - for what it's worth.

I also agree that instant licensing as proposed by the FCC was really dumb - a logistical nightmare of infinite proportion. I can visualize the numbers of people jumping on the air for the first time: "Hi, this is VE7GBT and I just passed the Technician test today." . . . "Funny, I don't remember any VE7GBT being issued a temporary callsign today."

```
=====
73 de Greg  AMPRNet   - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]
              AX.25    - ke4dpxg@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
              Internet - greg1@iglou.com
=====
```

-----

Date: 20 Jun 1994 06:35:05 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!EU.net!sunic!news.funet.fi!zippo.uwasa.fi!freeport.uwasa.fi!pales@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: lab power supplies  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Do you need Lab power supplies?  
For sale now !!!  
For more information please reply.

--

```
*****
* Petri Alestalo * pales@freeport.uwasa.fi * Fax 358-0-4003385 *
*****
```

-----

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 11:43:17 GMT  
From: iglou!greg1.slip.iglou.com!ke4dpx@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: RF problems in Ford Taurus???  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CrKqMo.Fqq@osuunx.ucc.okstate.edu> gcouger@olesun.okstate.edu (Gordon Cougar) writes:

>From: gcouger@olesun.okstate.edu (Gordon Couger)  
>Subject: Re: RF problems in Ford Taurus???  
>Date: Sat, 18 Jun 1994 03:49:34 GMT

>It seems my news reader is some what erratic. I am considering buying a late  
>model ford Taurus I would like to run 100 watts on 2 meters and 300 on HF.  
>Are there any problems I should be aware of??

I don't know specifically about 100 watts on 2 meters or 300 watts on HF, but  
I have used 50 watts on 2 meters with no problems in a '94 Taurus.

```
=====
73 de Greg  AMPRNet   - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]
              AX.25    - ke4dpxg@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
              Internet - greg1@iglou.com
=====
```

-----  
Date: 20 Jun 94 08:54:36 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!sunic!EU.net!sun4nl!ruuinf!  
ruunfs.fys.ruu.nl!faculty.chem.ruu.nl!besten@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Transatlantic 50 MHz Es opening  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Great News!!!

Yesterday, 19th june 1994, we had a great (well great...) opening  
towards the States here in Europe and especially Northern Europe.

The opening started at approx. 19.10 UTC in South Germany and at  
19.55 Z it reached our (i.e. the centre of the Netherlands) latitude.

During the 25 min opening I worked 36 american stations from  
the 1,2,3,4,5,8 district and a few VE3's. The opening disappeared at 20.20 Z.  
At 21.45 a small opening reoccured and three stations were worked.

Although a known phenomenon to active 50 MHz DX-ers, multi hop Es to the  
States at the latitude of the Netherlands is relatively rare.  
Please if you work PA's, DL's or ON's only give your grid square.  
Especially during a pile-up we don't have the faintest idea where all kinds  
of exotic names origin from :-) Also the name of the cat of your neighbour  
is of less importance to us ;-)

People in the southern part of Holland (\*sigh\*) were able to  
work CY9/WC9E and FP5EK (yes, the openings are that local that 15 km  
make a significant difference between booming 59 signals and hearing

\*nothing\* at all. When you live in the central or northern part of the Netherlands the opening already disappeared before you get the skip :-(((

Hope to work you on six too,

Remco PA3FYM

-----  
Date: Sun, 19 Jun 94 08:57:00 -0800  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!iat.holonet.net!megasys!  
tim.marek@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: TRANSVERTERS  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Do you have any more technical details like NF or Converter gain?  
Also does that price include a case? I would be curious to see how well it would perform on a crowded band. Thanks es 73s from DM09ep de NC7K..  
sk

-----  
Date: 20 Jun 1994 00:00:19 -0500  
From: illuminati.io.com!nobody@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2tmvvu\$1ql@cville-srv.wam.umd.edu>, <CrLInz.845@world.std.com>,  
<ke4dpx.8.00071ACE@gregl.slip.iglou.com>hnet.ed  
Subject : Re: IMMEDIATE LICENSING? Bad implementation. Good idea.

>  
>On the other hand, I don't see any reason the VECs could not file  
>electronically - for what it's worth.  
>

I don't see the delay from the VEC teams to the VEC.  
It's the FCC, \*not\* the VEC which slows things down.

I took my test Feb 12, and all my paperwork was submitted to the FCC on the 26th of February. The FCC took 10 more weeks to get it issued. 11 weeks, one day. Long wait.

So, again, I don't see where the VEC is to blame.  
In all, we'd save, oh, perhaps, 2-3 weeks of time?  
Maybe? And the fcc, still, would be taking 10 weeks to issue a license in general. NOT 10 weeks altogether, but 10 additional weeks from the time the VEC submits it.

--

.....  
Matt Rupert - 2984 Pheasant Run Dr. Apt D - Jackson MI 49202 - hoagy@io.com  
Personal Security / UNIX Enthusiast / Amatuer Radio - KB8SGL  
"Earn cash in your spare time - blackmail your friends."

-----  
Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 11:06:16 GMT  
From: iglou!greg1.slip.iglou.com!ke4dpx@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2skp70\$qbc@tymix.Tymnet.COM>, <1994Jun3.012445.4308@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<CqwFtu.GGp@news.Hawaii.Edu>p  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <CqwFtu.GGp@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>I wonder what you folks would do if there were suddenly no repeaters? You are  
>so hopelessly dependent upon someone else's radio (i.e., repeater) that you  
>would probably see your own radio as worthless (as someone has already  
>stated because he can't work any of the 440 closed repeaters).

>How sad.

>One of the first things I did when I got my first 2M radio (in 1976 - it  
>was a Clegg FM-27 - the very first synthesized 2M rig) was play on  
>146.76 - it was a simplex frequency back then. Simplex in the Valley  
>was very entertaining.

I have to agree that simplex is a lot more fun than repeaters. Of course repeaters have their place in the grand scheme of things, but it isn't nearly as much fun as trying to work simplex and the conversation isn't nearly as likely to be jammed by some pinhead with nothing better to do. As near as I can tell so far, there are about three regular jammers in the area and two seem to be using HTs. At first they got frustrated because we can so easily get over the top of them so they started using random DTMF sequences to jam the conversation. Even so, they aren't very smart about it and can be easily gotten around. The bottom line is that I have yet to hear any of them trying to jam a simplex frequency. I doubt their fragile egos could survive trying to jam simplex with an HT though.

=====  
73 de Greg AMPRNet - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]  
AX.25 - ke4dpxg@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam

Internet - greg1@iglou.com

=====

-----

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 11:36:54 GMT  
From: iglou!greg1.slip.iglou.com!ke4dpx@uunet.uu.net  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <bntyhntrCrIuxA.86D@netcom.com>, <2tsecn\$b71@hp-col.col.hp.com>,  
<2tsu7j\$d8i@oak.oakland.edu>uun  
Subject : Re: Simplex spacing on 2mtr

In article <2tsu7j\$d8i@oak.oakland.edu> prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu (prvalko)  
writes:

>Regardless of the repeater channel spacing (here in Michigan it's 20KHz)  
>simplex spacing (or spaving, if you will) remains 15KHz.

>Time Out for a rec.radio.amateur.misc "PET PEEVE"

>Heard on the repeater:

>"Where are you?"  
>"Uhhhh... 3rd and Walnut"  
>"Oh that's close! Wanna try simplex?"

>I think to myself, "Whoa! That's cool! Nobody does that anymore!"  
>Then I hear...

>"Sure... where do you want to go?"  
>"Uhhh... Five-Two?"  
>"O-kay! See you there! blah-blah... clear"

>Not that going to .52 is an evil thing, but I guess I still think of it  
>as a "calling" channel... even if it's dead most of the time. I think  
>that if you have invested in a multi-VFO, extened rcv/(tx),  
>multi-hundred dollar radio... you COULD try something like .55 or .58 or  
>7.42

Here in Kentucky it's 15KHz, and I know what you mean about people generally  
rag-chewing on 146.520. I don't consider it a 'pet peeve' but I do keep in  
mind that 146.520 is a calling frequency -- make your call, then move on to  
another frequency.

Here's my pet peeve and it happens all too often, most notably at the Dayton  
HamVention this year. Overheard on a wide-area repeater in Dayton:

"WB9VVV WB9XYZ"

"Hey, where are you?"

"I'm over by the concession stand next to the flea market area."

"I'm over in the tented area trying to find you. You find any good deals yet?"

... blah blah blah for 15 minutes ...

"Hey, you guys ever hear of simplex?!?! WB9ABC"

Why in the world anyone wants to use a wide-area repeater (or any repeater for that matter) when they are no more than 30 yards from each other is beyond me.

```
=====
73 de Greg  AMPRNet  - ke4dpx@ke4dpx.ampr.org [44.106.56.35]
              AX.25   - ke4dpxg@wi9p.#ncky.ky.usa.noam
              Internet - greg1@iglou.com
=====
```

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #684

\*\*\*\*\*